

for capital improvement and the many other policy decisions which require action by the responsible elected officials.

"We are now in the process of revising the planning operation to bring it more directly under the guidance of our Council of Governments. Planning is futile unless it is related to decisionmaking. Unless such a connection between planning and decision exists, a metropolitan area faces confusion, contention, and the chaos of inaction that would cost us dearly in the years ahead."

In these and other areas of our council's action, it has been a privilege and a challenge for me to serve as the Representative of the State of Oregon. I have been repeatedly impressed by the fact that simple cooperation among local governments cannot meet the metropolitan challenge. Both State and Federal Governments have roles to play.

Governor Harrison's Commonwealth has pioneered in far-seeing State legislation of local import. Annexation, city-county consolidation, and the present legislative study of local government seem to me to exemplify some of the constructive steps the States must take. Greater flexibility should be afforded to local governments by the States so that they may deal with new problems with the means most suitable to the circumstance. This applies, in my judgment, to the issues of local finance, to the question of the structure of local government, to the distribution of powers, functions, and responsibilities. Of course, I include in this prescription the authorization for cooperative and joint solution of interlocal problems. We should seek less to regulate and more to encourage local action on local matters.

One other State action should parallel that of Maryland, where Governor Tawes was so instrumental in initiating a Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Committee. I hope that the mandatory study commission required for the Portland metropolitan area by action of our legislature will find the same enthusiastic reception I am told is true in Baltimore. Hopefully, these commissions, and others like them, will help us identify and prevent potential problems before they reach the critical proportions that are represented by decayed and blighted areas in each of our major cities.

For some, massive Federal programs (such as public housing and urban renewal) are the only solution to the gamut of metropolitan problems. The Federal Government cannot escape concern for urban problems that extend well beyond State and local boundaries. In the field of transportation, water supply and sewage disposal, and others we could name, we are dealing with national and regional issues many of which cannot be solved by action of local governments or a single State.

The solid research produced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (established by President Eisenhower), the continuing congressional interest reflected in the special subcommittees on intergovernmental relations will be helpful in keeping national focus on the metropolitan problem.

It is my fervent hope that Federal action in the future will continue to provide us with the research data on which effective local, State, and regional action may be taken. I hope, too, that Federal action will encourage and support voluntary, cooperative, local, and State action and that the Council of State Governments may join with the American Municipal Association and the National Association of Counties in a similar effort.

It should be made easier for the States to enter into and give effect to compacts such as Inland and the Port of New York Authority. It should be the Federal purpose in matters such as water resources planning to take action which will strengthen rather than

weaken the sense of State and local purpose and responsibility. And, above all, it should encourage the kind of intergovernmental cooperation that preserves the significance of participation in the processes of local government.

I have talked of the critical metropolitan problems that concern our local, state and National Governments. I have described something of the cooperative effort in which we like you—have been engaged. I have not discussed metropolitan government—of the Dade County or Toronto type—less because they are controversial than because I am convinced that the councils of government can do the job, while preserving the responsiveness of government that is so essential to the success of democracy itself. It may be that other forms of government—like "metro"—will prove themselves equal to the metropolitan task, but I can assure you that our community (a stronghold of conservatism) finds our voluntary cooperation compact both acceptable and effective. It preserves home rule and it insures an approach to our problem that is responsive to local control. In Professor Adrian's words, "If our goal is to preserve the institutions of democracy, the burden of proof is on those who would take away the little governments (or give them nothing to decide, which amounts to the same thing)."

The voluntary council of governments does not take away the little governments." Instead it permits the study and solution of metropolitan problems on an areawide basis; permits the coordination of planning, decision-making, and execution; meets local problems in a democratic and responsive way; and improves the capacity of local government to remain the master of its own destiny.

It is clear that the strength of our democracy lies in local self-government and in the cooperative solution of our problems—where the problems are. We can cut at the roots of "the tree of liberty" by a steady centralization of governmental power and responsibility. Or we can nourish the tree. If local government is to continue to flourish, it must have the understanding support of the State and Federal Governments but it must also have the will to meet and solve—individually or cooperatively—the problems it confronts. This council—and others like it—provide a tool that widens and strengthens the capacity of local government. It must be our high resolve that we will never rest on our quest for patterns of local government fully equal to the needs of today and adaptable as well to needs of tomorrow. Only thus may we reduce the unevenness of our dealings and satisfy our commitment to the preservation of democracy and the tree of liberty.

Wasted Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House action in substantially reducing the foreign aid authorization has received tremendous acclaim from the American public. Since we will eventually consider a conference report on the authorization bill and later the appropriation for the current fiscal year, it would be well for us to continue to evaluate the foreign aid program.

In its editorial of September 4, the

Palos Regional in Palos, Ill., expressed an opinion typical of local publications across the country on the subject of "Wasted Foreign Aid," which I place in the Record at this point:

WASTED FOREIGN AID

Looking back to the beginning of foreign aid, and to the idealistic yet practical principles on which it was then postulated, gives one something of an Alice-in-Wonderland feeling.

The start is found in the Marshall plan. The idea was to use American resources to help rebuild war-shattered nations, and to bring about a peaceful, cooperative world based upon free institutions—including free popular elections.

The tragedy is that many billions of our foreign aid have been used for very different ends. It has gone to dictatorship, in which the people have no voice at all in affairs. Worst of all, it has gone, in instance after instance, to members of or sympathizers with the Communist bloc. Thus, our own dollars have been used to strengthen our enemies—and even to buy them advanced weapons of war.

One can understand that foreign aid distributions of billions of dollars are often wasteful and misdirected. That is inevitable in so vast an undertaking. But there can be no excuse for employing it to our own disadvantage and danger. A drastic change in policy has long been in order. Let us aid our friends, and stop right there.

A State Within a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent events in South Vietnam have once again raised the question of the role the Central Intelligence Agency plays in the formulation of foreign policy. In the 87th Congress and in this Congress, I have introduced bills which would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. On October 6, the New York Times published an editorial which supports legislation to establish such a committee and which I believe should be read by all of us. The editorial follows:

STATE WITHIN A STATE?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programmed, controlled, and directed—tend wilfully to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when